

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 2 has been amended, and claim 7 has been cancelled. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

This Amendment is supplemental to the Amendment filed June 7, 2004, which was entered by the Examiner.

In the Advisory Action mailed July 2, 2004, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 was allowed.

Claims 1-6 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.113:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 113 Response because:

- (a) rejected claim 7 has been cancelled;
- (b) the amendment was not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;
- (c) the amendment of claim 2 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added; and
- (d) the amendment does not significantly alter the scope of the claims and places the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features are being added.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

In the Office Action mailed February 10, 2004, at page 3, item 6, the Examiner rejected claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000061576 (hereinafter Hiroshi) in view of AAPA. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request

reconsideration.

Amended independent claim 2 separately delineates an upsetting operation and a cup forming operation. The upsetting operation makes "...an axially inwardly depressed recess defined in an end face of the large diameter portion...said recess having a tapered peripheral wall face, which defines a general shape of each of the chamfered portions..." and the cup forming operation shapes "...the elongated intermediate member to a shape having the cup body by a combined pushing method including a forward pushing and a rearward container pushing..."

The Examiner asserts that Hiroshi discloses the upsetting operation but not the cup forming operation, and that the AIPA states that the cup forming operation is part of Hiroshi. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation.

Hiroshi discloses a fourth process in which the third intermediate preform, W3, which has no recess formed in the large diameter part h (shown in FIG. 3(c)), is formed into the fourth intermediate preform W4 (shown in FIG. 3d). In this fourth process, both the cup body 1 and the chamfered portions 13 are formed in the same operation by cam fabricating sections P1, P2 and T of punch P. (See paragraphs [0017-0020] of the computer translated versions of Hiroshi, FIGS. 1, 3c, 3d, and 4, and lines 17-23 of the Abstract).

Further, the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 3 of the Specification of the subject application, which describes Hiroshi, recites:

"[according] to the above mentioned publication, an intermediate member which eventually forms the outer race is prepared by means of a combined pushing process including a forward pushing and a rearward container pushing, to thereby form a cup portion and, during this cup forming process, the chamfered portions are plastically formed by the use of a punch used to form the track grooves. Thereafter, during the subsequent drawing process to form the outer race to have a final design dimension and shape, the chamfered portions are also finished." (Emphasis added)

Thus, in the AIPA, the chamfered portions are formed during the cup forming process.

Applicants respectfully submit that both Hiroshi and the AIPA (which describes Hiroshi) disclose formation of the cup body 1 and the chamfered portions 13 in a single operation (the fourth process). In other words, in contrast to Hiroshi, in which the chamfered portions are formed during cup formation, the subject application discloses and claims formation of the chamfered portions during an upsetting operation, prior to a cup forming operation.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that a non-limiting example of an advantage of using the claimed invention is the ability to use molds having simplified shapes, thus reducing

time necessary to manufacture or replace tooling. Another non-limiting example of an advantage of using the claimed invention is that even when tooling is worn down, the simplified shape of the tooling facilitates repair of the tooling, thereby reducing repair time, and increasing overall productivity.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hiroshi nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest formation of the chamfered portions 13 and the cup body 1 in separate operations. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hiroshi nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest, a sequence of operations in which the cup body 1 is formed in an operation subsequent to an operation forming the chamfered portions 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that Independent claim 2 patentably distinguishes over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3-6, which ultimately depend from independent claim 2, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 2, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 13, 2004

By: Michael A. Bush

Michael A. Bush

Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being trans-
mitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on July 13, 2004

STAAS & HALSEY

By: [Signature]

Date July 13, 2004